

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/7174.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and management of M/s Bee Cee Steel Rolling Mills, Modern Industrial Estate, Bahadurgarh, District Rohtak:—

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 4 of 1982

between

SHRI BHAGWATI PARSHAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. BEE CEE  
STEEL ROLLING MILLS, MODERN INDUSTRIAL ESTATE BAHADURGARH  
DISTRICT ROHTAK

Present :—

None for the parties.

#### AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Bhagwati Parshad and the management of M/s Bee Cee Steel Rolling Mills, Modern Industrial Estate, Bahadurgarh, District Rohtak, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. ID/RTK/183/81/358, dated the 4th January, 1982:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Bhagwati Parshad, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as *Pattiman* on monthly wages of Rs 350/- but he was not allowed to enter the factory by the management on 31st August, 1984 when he reported for duty and as such, the respondent-management terminated his services unlawfully in gross violations of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. A detailed reply was filed by the respondent, alleging resignation by the workman on 31st August, 1981 after fully and finally settling his accounts with the management. Later on the management absented and as such, *ex parte* proceedings order passed against him. Prior to that on the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for decision on 5th July, 1982:—

- (1) Whether no industrial dispute exists between the parties and as such, the reference is bad in law?
- (2) Whether the Claim Statement has not been signed and presented by the proper person? If so, to what effect?
- (3) If issues Nos. 1 and 2 are decided against the management then whether the termination of services of Shri Bhagwati Parshad was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?
- (4) Whether the workman is gainfully employed? If so, to what effect?

4. Today none is present. So, it seems that the workman is not interested in the prosecution of the reference. So, this reference is dismissed for non-prosecution and the same is answered accordingly. There is no order as to costs.

Dated, the 19th September, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Bahadurgarh.

Endorsement No. 4/82/3275, dated the 1st October, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Bahadurgarh.

## AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section-10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between Shri Arun Kumar Sharma, workman and the Management of M/s Guru Nank Industries, C. P. 6-7 M, H. S. Railway Road, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication: —

Whether the termination of services of Shri Arun Kumar Sharma, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices were issued to both the parties. Shri Kuljit Singh representative for the Management, stated that the dispute between the workman and the Management had already been settled and that Ex. M-1 was the letter of the Management, Ex. M-2 was the photostet copy of payment of wages register and Ex. M-3 was the photo copy of settlement, according to which the workman's resignation had been accepted and that he had received the amount due to him in full and final settlement of his claim and that no dispute now left between the parties. He further stated that all these documents were correct. Shri B. M. Gupta, representative of workman stated that he had heard the above statement made by the representative of the management which was correct. In view of the testimony of Shri Kuljit Singh, representative of the Management and Shri B. M. Gupta, representative of the workman and recitals made in the documents Ex. M-1 to M-3, the dispute between the parties stands settled. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated, the 21st September, 1984.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 990, dated the 24th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/7205.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/S J. V. Electronics Ltd., Plot No. 163, Sector 24, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 587/1983

between

SHRIMATI RANI KNOWLES WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S J. V. ELECTRONICS  
Ltd., PLOT NO. 163, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri Manohar Lal for the workman

Shri M. L. Chako for the management

## AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shrimati Rani Knowles, workman and the management of M/s J. V. Electronics Limited, Plot No. 163, Sector 24, Faridabad to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shrimati Rani Knowles was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

Notices were issued to both the parties. Shri M. L. Chako representative of the Management, stated that the dispute between the workman and the Management had already been settled and that Ex. M-1 was the letter while Ex. M-2 was the copy of the settlement and that Ex. M-3 was the receipt executed by the workman, according to which he had received Rs 6,360 in full and final settlement of her claim and that no dispute was now left between the parties. He further stated that these documents were correct. Shri Manohar Lal, representative of the workman stated that he had heard the statement made by the representative of the Management. In view of the testimony of Shri M. L. Chako representative of the Management and recitals made in the documents Ex. M-1 to M-3, the dispute between the parties stands settled. The award is passed accordingly.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated: the 21st September, 1984.

Endorsement No: 99, dated 24th September, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-Lab/7206.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Radiator Ltd., Plot No. 107, Sector 24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 589/1983

between

SHRI SURYA NATH RAI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA  
RADIATOR LTD., PLOT NO. 107, SECTOR 24, FARIDABAD

Present :

None.

AWARD.

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Surya Nath Rai, workman and the management of M/s Haryana Radiator Ltd., Plot No. 107, Sector 24, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Surya Nath Rai, was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Notices were issued to both the parties. On the last date of hearing none was present on behalf of both the parties. In spite of service and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against both the parties. It appears that both the parties are not interested in the reference. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated: the 24th September, 1984.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 992, dated 24th September, 1984

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/7208.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Capital Flour Mills, Sector-6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 26/1984

between

SHRI BAKSHA RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. CAPITAL  
FLOUR MILLS, SECTOR-6, FARIDABAD.

Present :

None.

#### AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Baksha Ram, workman and the management of M/s Capital Flour Mills, Sector-6, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Baksha Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices were issued to both the parties. On the last date of hearing, none was present on behalf of the workman even though he was represented earlier and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the workman. The management has already been proceeded *ex parte*. It appears that both the parties are not interested in the reference. The award is passed accordingly.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 24th September, 1984.

Endorsement No. 994, dated the 24th September, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/7210.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following

award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s H. C. M. Plating Corporation, 390/24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 410/1983

*between*

SHRI SHUKVIR WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S H. C. M. PLATING CORPORATION, 390/24, FARIDABAD

Present: None.

### AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Shukvir workman and the management of M/s H. C. M. Plating Corporation, 390/24, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :-

Whether the termination of service of Shri Shukvir was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices were issued to both the parties. On the last date of hearings none was present on behalf of the workman even though he was represented on the previous date of hearing. Correct address of the management had not been filed. Consequently the *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the workman. It appears that the workman is not interested in the reference. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated, the 1st October, 1984.

R. N. BATRA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad,

Endorsement No. 1002, dated 3rd October, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner, and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 5th November, 1984

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/7259—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Anand Synthetics Pvt. Ltd., 14/2, Mathura Road, Faridabad :-

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R.N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT FARIDABAD .

Reference No. 261 of 1982

*between*

SHRI VIJAY LAL, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S ANAND SYNTHETICS PVT. LTD., 14/2, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri Narain Parshad, for the workman.

None, for the respondent-management.

## AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/147/82/48667, dated 26th October, 1982, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the industrial dispute existing between Shri Vijay Lal workman and the respondent management of M/s Anand Synthetic Pvt. Ltd., 14/2, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Vijay Lal was justified and in order ? If not to what relief is he entitled ?

The respondent management was proceeded *ex parte* on 9th August, 1984 as none appeared for them. According to the averment of the workman he was appointed on 12th September, 1974 and his services were terminated on 25th August, 1984. No retrenchment compensation was paid to him.

The workman has appeared on oath in his *ex parte* evidence and has supported his averments. There is no reason to disbelieve his statement. I, therefore, find that the services of the workman were terminated illegally. I, therefore, give the award that he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

Dated the 24th September, 1984.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2289, dated 8th October, 1984

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court,  
Faridabad.

M. SETH,

Secretary to Government, Haryana,  
Labour and Employment Departments.

अम विभाग

आदेश

दिनांक 19 अक्टूबर, 1984

सं. प्रो. वि./अम्बाला/31-82/39033.—चूँकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल को राय है कि मै. ओरियन्टल सर्विस एजेंट्स वर्कशॉप, अम्बाला कैंट, के श्रमिक श्री बन्सी लाल तथा उसके प्रबन्धकों के मध्य इसमें इस के बाद लिखित मामले में कोई औद्योगिक विवाद है :

और चूँकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल विवाद को न्यायनिर्णय हेतु निर्दिष्ट करना बांछनीय समझते हैं :

इसलिए, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) द्वारा प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हरियाणा के राज्यपाल इसके द्वारा सरकारी अधिसूचना सं० 3(44)84-3-अम, दिनांक 18 अप्रैल, 1984 द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित अम न्यायालय, अम्बाला को विवादग्रस्त या उससे संबंधित नीचे लिखा मामला न्यायनिर्णय के लिए निर्दिष्ट करते हैं, जो कि उक्त प्रबन्धकों तथा श्रमिक के बीच या तो विवादग्रस्त मामला है या विवाद से सुसंगत प्रत्येक संबंधित मामला है :—

क्या श्री बन्सी लाल की सेवाओं का स्थापन न्यायोचित तथा ठीक है ? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस राहत का हकदार है ?